

scope of protection. Claims 24 and 27 are independent.

Favorable reconsideration is requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 24 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent No. 4,989,163 (Kawamata et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,727,435 (Otani et al.) and well known prior art. Claims 26 and 29 were rejected over Kawamata et al., Otani and the well known prior art in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,218,458 (Kochis et al.).

Applicants respectfully traverse.

The present invention as defined in Claim 24 is directed to an image processing device, comprising a scanner for inputting an image signal, an image processing circuit for performing image processing necessary for copying on the image signal input from the scanner to provide a first processed image signal, a bidirectional interface for transmitting the image signal input by the scanner to an external computer, the external computer performing image processing necessary for copying on the transmitted image signal to provide a second processed image signal, the bidirectional interface receiving the second processed image signal from the external computer, and output means for

outputting the first processed image signal or the second processed image signal.

In accordance with an advantageous aspect of the present invention, the device has a plurality of modes including first and second copying modes, the device interlockingly using the scanner, the bidirectional interface and the output means in the first copying mode to perform copying based on the second processed image signal, and interlockingly using the scanner, the image processing circuit and the output means in the second mode to perform copying based on the first processed image signal.

Thus, according to Claim 24, a plurality of copying modes are provided. When an original document is copied, it is possible to select the first copying mode which does not use an external computer or, alternatively, the second copying mode that does utilize the external computer.

Kawamata et al. is directed to a photo printer having a host computer assist function and a method of controlling the same. The Office Action asserts on pages 2-3 that Kawamata et al. discloses, at col. 8, lines 9-15, extracting data from the memory 10 in the controller 2 and sending it to the computer 1, and then transferring the data

from the computer 1 to the printer 3, which allegedly "reads on a first mode for transferring a second processed signal from the computer to the printer." (Page 3, lines 2-3).

However, Claim 24 does not recite modes for "transferring a signal from the computer to the printer"; it recites copying modes, wherein an original image is copied. As defined in Claim 24, this involves copying the image signal from the scanner. The cited lines in Kawamata et al., as understood by Applicants, have nothing to do with copying image data input from scanner 4; they relate to the second embodiment wherein data from the computer 1 is sent to the controller 2 (col. 7, lines 7-17). Applicants submit that this process is not a copying process, and that it does not correspond to the recitations in Claim 24.

Applicant further submits that Otani fails to teach or suggest this copying mode. While Otani does disclose an on-line mode which transmits/receives image data to/from an external image processing apparatus, Applicant submits that this on-line mode is used to connect an image information input device with an image information output device of the apparatus.

Furthermore, Applicant has found no teaching or suggestion in Otani et al. to modify its disclosed modes, and therefore submits that even the combination of Otani et al. with Kawamata et al. fails to suggest the present invention as defined in the amended claims.

Applicant further submits that the cited well known prior art of adjusting colors and other features fails to remedy the above-discussed deficiencies of the cited prior art as references against the claims.

Independent Claim 27 is a method claim corresponding to apparatus Claim 24, and is believed to be patentably distinct from the cited prior art for the same reasons.

The remaining claims depend from one of Claims 24 and 27 and partake of the novelty thereof.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections and to allow the amended claims.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All

correspondence should be directed to our new address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Abigail Cousins  
Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 29,292

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_MAIN 11157 v 1